

# **COUNTRY HAVEN UTILITIES (PWS 6060013) SOURCE WATER ASSESSMENT FINAL REPORT**

---

**June 27, 2002**



**State of Idaho  
Department of Environmental Quality**

**Disclaimer:** This publication has been developed as part of an informational service for the source water assessments of public water systems in Idaho and is based on the data available at the time and the professional judgement of the staff. Although reasonable efforts have been made to present accurate information, no guarantees, including expressed or implied warranties of any kind, are made with respect to this publication by the State of Idaho or any of its agencies, employees, or agents, who also assume no legal responsibility for the accuracy of presentations, comments, or other information in this publication. The assessment is subject to modification if new data is produced.

## Executive Summary

Under the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1996, all states are required by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to assess every source of public drinking water for its relative sensitivity to contaminants regulated by the act. This assessment is based on a land use inventory of the designated assessment area and sensitivity factors associated with the wells and aquifer characteristics.

This report, *Source Water Assessment for Country Haven Utilities, Rockford, Idaho* describes the public drinking water system, the boundaries of the zones of water contribution, and the associated potential contaminant sources located within these boundaries. This assessment should be used as a planning tool, taken into account with local knowledge and concerns, to develop and implement appropriate protection measures for this source. **The results should not be used as an absolute measure of risk and they should not be used to undermine public confidence in the water system.**

Final susceptibility scores are derived from equally weighting system construction scores, hydrologic sensitivity scores, and potential contaminant/land use scores. Therefore, a low rating in one or two categories coupled with a higher rating in other categories results in a final rating of low, moderate, or high susceptibility. With the potential contaminants associated with most urban and heavily agricultural areas, the best score a well can get is moderate. Potential contaminants are divided into four categories, inorganic contaminants (IOCs, i.e. nitrates, arsenic), volatile organic contaminants (VOCs, i.e. petroleum products), synthetic organic contaminants (SOCs, i.e. pesticides), and microbial contaminants (i.e. bacteria). As different wells can be subject to various contamination settings, separate scores are given for each type of contaminant.

The Country Haven Utilities (PWS 6060013) drinking water system currently consists of two well sources: Well #1 and Well #2. The wells are located approximately ten miles west of the City of Blackfoot near Rockford, east of State Route 39. Water from the wells is pumped directly into the distribution system. The public water system serves approximately 150 persons with 45 unmetered connections.

The potential contaminant sources identified within the delineated time-of-travel (TOT) zones include major transportation corridors (State Route 39, Highway 26, railroad), a major surface water source (Aberdeen-Springfield Canal), dairies, a Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) Facility, a wastewater land application (WLAP) site, a gravel mine, recharge points, deep injection wells and local businesses. A complete list of potential contaminant sources is provided with this assessment (Table 2).

For the assessment, a review of laboratory tests for Country Haven Utilities was conducted. Between January 1993 and January 2002, total coliform bacteria were detected at various locations within the distribution system. When bacteria was identified in September 1999, a boil advisory was required. Since January 2002, no total coliform has been detected in the system. No SOCs or VOCs have been detected in the water samples taken at the sample taps for the wells. However, there have been IOCs and radionuclides (RADs) identified. Well #1 detected arsenic, calcium, fluoride, gross alpha, gross beta, iron, nitrate, combined radium, radium-226 and sodium between May 1985 and December 2001. Well #2 detected arsenic, fluoride, gross alpha, gross beta, nitrate, combined radium, radium-226 and sodium between December 1996 and December 2001. All chemical results for Well #1 and Well #2 did not meet or exceed the maximum contaminant level (MCL) set by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for each chemical. In December 1996,

arsenic was detected at 6 micrograms per liter ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ ) in Well #1 and 9  $\mu\text{g/L}$  in Well #2, which, at the time, is below the MCL of 50  $\mu\text{g/L}$ . In October 2001, the EPA lowered the arsenic MCL to 10  $\mu\text{g/L}$ , giving systems until 2006 to comply with the new standard.

The nitrate history (between the years of 1985 and 2001) for Well #1 and Well #2 show that all samples taken were well below the MCL of 10.0 milligrams per liter ( $\text{mg/L}$ ). Nitrate concentrations for Well #1 range from 1.77  $\text{mg/L}$  to 2.61  $\text{mg/L}$ . The nitrates found in Well #2 range from 2.24  $\text{mg/L}$  to 2.72  $\text{mg/L}$ .

The Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) in 2000 conducted a Sanitary Survey for Country Haven Utilities. The survey provides an overview and needed improvements to the public water system. In June 1999, the system replaced the well cap for Well #2 with one that is intended for outdoor use (Country Haven Utilities, 2002). Other system improvements that need to be made were to install an approved casing vent on Well #1 so that the space between the well casing and column is vented to the atmosphere. An approved screen should be placed over the casing vent to prevent animals or insects access to the well. Clean and paint well house valves to piping to prevent further rusting and deterioration. The pump house should have a proper drain to prevent damage that may result from surface water flooding. Making the improvements outlined in the sanitary survey may prolong the life of the well and reduce the chance of contaminants entering the drinking water system.

The capture zones for the wells intersect a priority area for the synthetic organic chemical atrazine. The organic priority areas are areas where greater than 25 % of the wells show levels greater than 1% of the primary standard or other health standards. Atrazine is a widely used herbicide for control of broadleaf and grassy weeds.

The susceptibility ratings for the Country Haven Utilities drinking water system were based upon available information relating to soil drainage characteristics, agricultural land use, system construction, and potential contaminant sources identified within each well's zones of contribution. The final susceptibility ranking for Well #1 and Well #2 were rated high for IOCs, VOCs, SOCs, and microbial contaminants.

This assessment should be used as a basis for determining appropriate new protection measures or re-evaluating existing protection efforts. No matter what ranking a source receives, protection is always important. Whether the source is currently located in a "pristine" area or an area with numerous industrial and/or agricultural land uses that require surveillance, the way to ensure good water quality in the future is to act now to protect valuable water supply resources. If the system should need to expand in the future, new well sites should be located in areas with as few potential sources of contamination as possible, and the site should be reserved and protected for this specific use.

For Country Haven Utilities, drinking water protection activities should focus on correcting any deficiencies outlined in the sanitary survey (an inspection conducted every five years with the purpose of determining the physical condition of a water system's components and its capacity). There should be no application or storage of herbicides, pesticides, or other chemicals within 50 feet of a public water system well. Another protective measure would be to limit the use of roads that pass within 50 feet of a well. The system should continue their efforts to keep the distribution system free of microbial contamination. Any new sources that could be considered potential contaminants that reside within a well's zones of contribution should be investigated and monitored to evaluate the threat of contamination the source may pose in the future.

Land uses within most of the source water assessment area are outside the direct jurisdiction of Country Haven Utilities. Therefore partnerships with state and local agencies, industrial and commercial groups should be established to ensure future land uses are protective of ground water quality. Educating employees and the public about source water will further assist the system in its monitoring and protection efforts.

Due to the time involved with the movement of ground water, drinking water protection activities should be aimed at long-term management strategies even though these strategies may not yield results in the near term. A strong public education program should be a primary focus of any drinking water protection plan. Public education topics could include proper lawn and garden care practices, household hazardous waste disposal methods, proper care and maintenance of septic systems, and the importance of water conservation to name but a few. There are multiple resources available to help communities implement protection programs, including the Drinking Water Academy of the EPA. Drinking water protection activities for agriculture should be coordinated with the Idaho State Department of Agriculture and the Bingham County Soil and Water Conservation District. As major transportation corridors that intersect the delineation (such as State Route 39 and Highway 26), the Idaho Department of Transportation should be involved in protection efforts. If the system should need to expand in the future, new well sites should be located in areas with as few potential sources of contamination as possible, and the site should be reserved and protected for this specific use.

A system must incorporate a variety of strategies in order to develop a comprehensive drinking water protection plan, be they regulatory in nature (i.e. zoning, permitting) or non-regulatory in nature (i.e. good housekeeping, public education, specific best management practices). For assistance in developing protection strategies please contact the Pocatello Regional Office of the DEQ or the Idaho Rural Water Association.

# SOURCE WATER ASSESSMENT FOR COUNTRY HAVEN UTILITIES, ROCKFORD, IDAHO

## Section 1. Introduction - Basis for Assessment

The following sections contain information necessary to understand how and why this assessment was conducted. **It is important to review this information to understand what the ranking of this source means.** A map showing the delineated source water assessment area and the inventory of significant potential sources of contamination identified within that area are contained in this report. The list of significant potential contaminant source categories and their rankings used to develop this assessment is also attached.

### Background


Under the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1996, all states are required by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to assess every source of public drinking water for its relative susceptibility to contaminants regulated by the Safe Drinking Water Act. This assessment is based on a land use inventory of the delineated assessment area and sensitivity factors associated with the wells and aquifer characteristics.

### Level of Accuracy and Purpose of the Assessment

Since there are over 2,900 public water sources in Idaho, there is limited time and resources to accomplish the assessments. All assessments must be completed by May of 2003. An in-depth, site-specific investigation of each significant potential source of contamination is not possible. **Therefore, this assessment should be used as a planning tool, taken into account with local knowledge and concerns, to develop and implement appropriate protection measures for this source. The results should not be used as an absolute measure of risk and they should not be used to undermine public confidence in the water system.**

The ultimate goal of the assessment is to provide data to local communities to develop a protection strategy for their drinking water supply system. The Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) recognizes that pollution prevention activities generally require less time and money to implement than treatment of a public water supply system once it has been contaminated. DEQ encourages communities to balance resource protection with economic growth and development. The information necessary to develop a drinking water protection program should be determined by the local community and be based upon its own needs and limitations. Wellhead or drinking water protection is one facet of a comprehensive growth plan, and it can complement ongoing local planning efforts.

**Figure 1 - Geographic Location of the Country Haven Utilities Public Water System: 6060013, Well #1and Well #2**



## Section 2. Conducting the Assessment

### General Description of the Source Water Quality

Country Haven Utilities is a community public drinking water system located in Bingham County.

It is near Rockford and east of Highway 39 (Figure 1). This system currently has two well sources that serve approximately 150 persons with 45 unmetered connections. At this time, there appears to be no primary water quality issues associated with the system.

A review of the Country Haven Utilities water chemistry history was conducted using the State Drinking Water Information System (SDWIS) and hardcopy laboratory results. No synthetic organic contaminants (SOCs) or volatile organic contaminants (VOCs) were detected in the water samples taken from the public drinking water wells. However, inorganic contaminants (IOCs), and radionuclides (RADs) were detected in the wells but were below the maximum contaminant level (MCL) set by the EPA.

Well #1 and Well #2 are located on Veljean Street in Rockford. Well #1, the primary well, is located south of Well #2. Well #2 is considered the secondary or backup well for the system. As for contaminants identified in the wells, Well #1 detected arsenic, calcium, fluoride, gross alpha, gross beta, iron, nitrate, combined radium, radium-226 and sodium between May 1985 and December 2001. Well #2 detected arsenic, fluoride, gross alpha, gross beta, nitrate, combined radium, radium-226 and sodium between December 1996 and December 2001. All chemical results for Well #1 and Well #2 did not meet or exceed the maximum contaminant level (MCL) set by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for each chemical. In December 1996, arsenic was detected at 6 micrograms per liter ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ ) in Well #1 and 9  $\mu\text{g/L}$  in Well #2, which, at the time, is below the MCL of 50  $\mu\text{g/L}$ . In October 2001, the EPA lowered the arsenic MCL to 10  $\mu\text{g/L}$ , giving systems until 2006 to comply with the new standard.

The nitrate history (between the years of 1985 and 2001) for Well #1 and Well #2 show that all samples taken were well below the MCL of 10.0 milligrams per liter ( $\text{mg/L}$ ). Nitrate concentrations for Well #1 range from 1.77  $\text{mg/L}$  to 2.61  $\text{mg/L}$ . The nitrates found in Well #2 range from 2.24  $\text{mg/L}$  to 2.72  $\text{mg/L}$ .

The capture zones for the wells intersect a priority area for the synthetic organic chemical atrazine. The organic priority areas are areas where greater than 25 % of the wells show levels greater than 1% of the primary standard or other health standards. Atrazine is a widely used herbicide for control of broadleaf and grassy weeds.

Additionally, there have been detects of total coliform bacteria within the distribution system, but no bacterial contamination has been found at the wellheads. When bacterial contamination was identified in September 1999, a boil advisory was required until the bacteria was absent from the system.

## **Defining the Zones of Contribution--Delineation**

The delineation process establishes the physical area around a well that will become the focal point of the assessment. The process includes mapping the boundaries of the zone of contribution into time-of-travel zones (zones indicating the number of years necessary for a particle of water to reach a pumping well) for water in the aquifer. Washington Group International (WGI) was contracted by DEQ to define the public water system's zones of contribution. WGI used a refined computer model approved by the EPA in determining the 3-year (Zone 1B), 6-year (Zone 2), and 10-year (Zone 3) Time-of-Travel (TOT) for water associated with the East Margin Area of the Eastern Snake River Plain (ESRP) hydrologic province. Country Haven Utilities falls within this hydrologic province. The computer model was assimilated by the WGI using site specific data from a variety of sources including nearby well logs, operator records, and hydrogeologic reports. Although there are two drinking water wells associated with this system, the delineation in this assessment represents both wells based upon similarities in hydrogeologic characteristics. A summary of the hydrogeologic information from the WGI Source Area Delineation Report is provided below.


The East Margin Area encompasses 821 square miles, representing approximately 8 percent of the total area of the ESRP hydrologic province. The majority of the East Margin Area is within Bingham County, with small areas occurring in Bannock, Bonneville, and Power counties.

The regional ESRP aquifer is the most significant aquifer in the East Margin Area and consists primarily of basalt of the Quaternary-aged Snake River Group. However, additional water-bearing units are used for water supply along the margin of the ESRP. In order of decreasing age, the most significant aquifers in the Michaud Flats area are bedded rhyolite (volcanic rock) of the Tertiary-aged Starlight Formation and Quaternary-aged pediment gravels formed by running water, basalt of the Big Hole Formation, and stream deposits of the Sunbeam Formation (see Jacobson, 1982, p. 7, and Corbett, et al., 1980, pp. 6-10). A few shallow domestic wells in the central Michaud Flats area also are completed in Michaud Gravel, which is the shallow water-table aquifer. The American Falls Lake Beds Formation (AFLB) confines the deeper aquifers and averages 80 feet in thickness in the central Michaud Flats area (Jacobson, 1984, p. 6). The AFLB pinches out in the eastern Michaud Flats area near the Portneuf River, effectively combining the shallow and deep stream deposits into a single water table aquifer (Bechtel, 1994, p. 2-2). Other aquifers in the East Margin Area include fractured quartzite that has been developed near Blackfoot, stream deposits near the cities of Firth and Basalt, and pediment gravels in the Gibson Terrace area near Tyhee and Chubbuck.

Public water system (PWS) wells in the East Margin Area of the ESRP province produce water from five different aquifers: the Regional Eastern Snake River Plain aquifer, three alluvial or stream deposited aquifers (Eastern Michaud Flats, Firth/Basalt, and Gibson Terrace/Pocatello Bench), and a quartzite aquifer near Blackfoot. The conceptual model for the Regional Eastern Snake River Plain Aquifer in which the Country Haven Utilities public water system resides is presented below.



FIGURE 2. Country Haven Utilities Delineation Map and Potential Contaminant Source Locations



**PWS# 6060013**  
**WELL #1 & #2**

## **Regional Eastern Snake River Plain Aquifer**

The ESRP is a northeast trending basin located in southeastern Idaho. The 10,000 square miles of the plain are primarily filled with highly fractured layered Quaternary-aged basalt flows of the Snake River Group, which are between layers of rocks formed by sediment deposition along the margins (Garabedian, 1992, p. 5). Quaternary-aged basalts are estimated to be 100 to 1,500 feet thick, with the majority of the area in the range of 100 to 500 feet thick (Whitehead, 1992, Plate 3). Individual basalt flows range from 10 to 50 feet thick, averaging 20 to 25 feet thick (Lindholm, 1996, p. 14). Basalt is thickest in the central part of the eastern plain and thins toward the margins. Whitehead (1992, p. 9) estimates the total thickness of the flows to be as great as 5,000 feet. A thin layer (0 to 100 feet) of windblown and stream-produced sediments overlies the basalt. The plain is bounded on the northeast by rocks of the Yellowstone Group (mainly rhyolite) and Idavada Volcanics to the southwest. These rocks may also underlie the plain (Garabedian, 1992, p. 5). Granite of the Idaho batholith borders the plain to the northwest, along with sedimentary rocks and metamorphic rocks (altered by heat and/or pressure) (Cosgrove et al., 1999, p. 10). The Snake River flows along part of the southern boundary and is the only drainage that leaves the plain. A high degree of connectivity with the regional aquifer system is displayed over much of the river as it passes through the plain. However, some reaches are believed to be perched or separated from the main ground water by unsaturated rock, such as the Lewisville-to-Shelly reach. Rivers and streams entering the plain from the south are tributary to the Snake River. With the exception of the Big and Little Wood rivers, rivers entering from the north vanish into the basalts of the Snake River Plain aquifer that have a higher ability to transmit water.

The layered basalts of the Snake River Group host one of the most productive aquifers in the United States. The aquifer is generally considered unconfined, yet may be confined locally because of interbedded clay and dense unfractured basalt (Whitehead, 1992, p. 26). Whitehead (1992, p. 22) and Lindholm (1996, p. 1) report that well yields of 2,000 to 3,000 gal/min are common for wells open to less than 100 feet of the aquifer. Transmissivities obtained from test data in the upper 100 to 200 feet of the aquifer range from less than 0.1 ft<sup>2</sup>/sec to 56 ft<sup>2</sup>/sec ( $1.0 \times 10^4$  to  $4.8 \times 10^6$  ft<sup>2</sup>/day; Garabedian, 1992, p. 11, and Lindholm, 1996, p. 18). Lindholm (1996, p. 18) estimates aquifer thickness to range from 100 feet near the plain's margin to thousands of feet near the center. Models of the regional aquifer have used values ranging from 200 to 3,000 feet to represent aquifer thickness (Cosgrove et al., 1999, p. 15).

Regional ground water flow is to the southwest paralleling the basin (Cosgrove et al., 1999; deSonneville, 1972, p. 78; Garabedian, 1992, p. 48; and Lindholm, 1996, p. 23). Reported water table gradients range from 3 to 100 ft/mile and average 12 ft/mile (Lindholm, 1996, p. 22). Gradients steepen at the plain's margin and at discharge locations. The estimated effective ratio of the rock's open space volume to its total volume range from 0.04 to more than 0.25 (Ackerman, 1995, p. 1, and Lindholm, 1996, p. 16).

The majority of aquifer recharge results from surface water irrigation activities (incidental recharge), which divert water from the Snake River and its tributaries (Ackerman, 1995, p. 4, and Garabedian, 1992, p. 11) and locally from canal leakage. Natural recharge occurs through stream losses, direct precipitation, and tributary basin underflow.

Aquifer discharge occurs primarily as seeps and springs on the northern wall of the Snake River canyon near Thousand Springs and near American Falls and Blackfoot (Garabedian, 1992, p. 17). To a lesser degree, discharge also occurs through pumping and underflow.

The East Margin Area is among the most transmissive regions of the regional aquifer, therefore it has a higher ability to transmit water. A transmissivity of  $21 \text{ ft}^2/\text{sec}$  was used to represent the upper 200 feet of the regional aquifer in the East Margin Area in the three-dimensional USGS ground water flow model (Garabedian, 1992, Plate 6). The equivalent hydraulic conductivity or the rate at which water can move through permeable material is 9,072 ft/day. This value is consistent with the range of hydraulic conductivity, the rate water flows through a cross section, (9,500 to 11,708 ft/day) calculated using data from a constant-rate aquifer test conducted in 1981 (Jacobson, 1982, p. 23). This range was calculated by dividing the estimated transmissivity (228,000 to 281,000  $\text{ft}^2/\text{day}$ ) by the perforated interval of the observation well (24 feet). The geometric mean hydraulic conductivity based on analysis of specific capacity data from PWS wells (135 ft/day) is significantly lower. A published water table map of the Upper Snake River Basin (IDWR, 1997, p. 9) indicates that the ground water flow direction in the ESRP aquifer in the East Margin Area is similar to that depicted at the regional scale (e.g., Garabedian, 1992, Plate 4).

Recharge from precipitation and surface water irrigation in the East Margin Area ranges from less than 10 to more than 20 inches per year (Garabedian, 1992, Plate 8). The low end of the range applies to the area near Blackfoot, while the high end applies to the area on the west side of American Falls Reservoir near Aberdeen.

Kjelstrom (1995, p. 13) reports an annual river loss of 280,000 acre-feet to the regional basalt aquifer for the 27.5-mile Lewisville-to-Shelley reach of the Snake River and 110,000 acre-feet for the 23.5-mile Shelley-to-Blackfoot reach. Annual river gains of 1,900,000 acre-feet for the 36.6-mile Blackfoot-to-Neeley reach are also estimated (Kjelstrom, 1995, p. 13). A seepage study conducted in the fall of 1980 on the Portneuf River showed a gain of about  $560 \text{ ft}^3/\text{sec}$  (405,691 acre-feet) for the 13-mile Pocatello-to-American Falls Reservoir reach (Jacobson, 1982, p. 16). The average flow in the Blackfoot River near the city of Blackfoot is low at Station #13068500 (5.2 cfs; USGS, 2001) compared to the flow in the Snake River near the city of Blackfoot at Station #13069500 (2,900 cfs; USGS, 2001).

The delineated source water assessment area for Country Haven Utilities drinking water wells trends in a north northeasterly direction and is conical in shape. The capture zones for the wells within the Regional Eastern Snake River Plain Aquifer have a maximum length of 33 miles (WGI 2001, p. 18). The delineation for the Country Haven Utilities wells is approximately 28 miles in length with the narrowest area near the wellhead locations is approximately .25 of a mile wide. The widest area of the delineation to the north near Idaho Falls is approximately 10 miles (Figure 2). The actual data used by WGI in determining the source water assessment delineation are available from DEQ upon request.



## **Identifying Potential Sources of Contamination**

A potential source of contamination is defined as any facility or activity that stores, uses, or produces, as a product or by-product, the contaminants regulated under the Safe Drinking Water Act. Furthermore, these sources have a sufficient likelihood of releasing such contaminants into the environment at levels that could pose a concern relative to drinking water sources. The goal of the inventory process is to locate and describe those facilities, land uses, and environmental conditions that are potential sources of ground water contamination. The locations of potential sources of contamination within the delineation areas were obtained by field surveys conducted by DEQ and from available databases.

It is important to understand that a release may never occur from a potential source of contamination provided best management practices are used at the facility. Many potential sources of contamination are regulated at the federal level, state level, or both to reduce the risk of release. Therefore, when a business, facility, or property is identified as a potential contaminant source, this should not be interpreted to mean that this business, facility, or property is in violation of any local, state, or federal environmental law or regulation. What it does mean is that the potential for contamination exists due to the nature of the business, industry, or operation. There are a number of methods that water systems can use to work cooperatively with potential sources of contamination, such as educational visits and inspections of stored materials. Many owners of such facilities may not even be aware that they are located near a public water supply well.

## **Contaminant Source Inventory Process**

A two-phased contaminant inventory of the study area was conducted during 2002. The first phase involved identifying and documenting potential contaminant sources within the Country Haven Utilities source water assessment area through the use of computer databases and Geographic Information System (GIS) maps developed by DEQ. The second, or enhanced, phase of the contaminant inventory involved contacting the operator to validate the sources identified in phase one and to add any additional potential sources in the area. This task was undertaken with the assistance of Ms. Sheila Babneau with the Country Haven Utilities water system. At the time of the enhanced inventory, no additional potential contaminant sources were found within the delineated source water area. Figures with well locations, delineated areas, and potential contaminant sources are provided with this report (Figure 2). Each potential contaminant source has been given a unique site number that references tabular information associated with the public water well (Table 2).

Potential contaminant sources were found within the 3-year TOT zone. These sources include two major transportation corridors, State Route 39 and the railroad, that are located west of the wells. A major surface water source, the Aberdeen-Springfield Canal, is located to the north of the well locations. Major transportation corridors and surface water sources could potentially contaminate the ground water through herbicide usage and by accidental spills or releases. There is a wastewater land application (WLAP) site. The WLAP site is potentially a non-point source for inorganic and microbial contaminants. Also found was a SARA site (associated with fertilizers), dairies, and businesses that are considered possible contaminant sources. In the 6-year TOT zone there is a mine, and the 10-year TOT zone shows several deep injection wells and recharge point locations. Deep injection wells regulated under the Idaho Department of Water Resources (IDWR) are generally used for the disposal of stormwater runoff or agricultural field drainage.

Recharge point locations include active, proposed, and possible recharge sites located on the Snake River Plain. Regarding the area closest to the wells, contaminants of potential concern should be outside of each wellheads sanitary setback (50-foot radius around the wellhead) to provide additional protection for the wells. Refer to Table 2 for the complete list of potential contaminant sources. For locations of wells, the TOT delineations and potential contaminant sources refer to Figure 2.

### **Section 3. Susceptibility Analyses**

Each well's susceptibility to contamination was ranked as high, moderate, or low risk according to the following considerations: hydrologic characteristics, physical integrity of the well, land use characteristics, and potentially significant contaminant sources. The susceptibility rankings are specific to a particular potential contaminant or category of contaminants. Therefore, a high susceptibility rating relative to one potential contaminant does not mean that the water system is at the same risk for all other potential contaminants. The relative ranking that is derived for a well is a qualitative, screening-level step that, in many cases, uses generalized assumptions and best professional judgement. Appendix A contains a susceptibility analysis worksheet for each well in the assessment. The following summaries describe the rationale for the susceptibility ranking.

#### **Hydrologic Sensitivity**

The hydrologic sensitivity of a well is dependent upon four factors. These factors are surface soil composition, the material in the vadose zone (between the land surface and the water table), the depth to first ground water, and the presence of a 50-foot thick fine-grained zone above the water producing zone of the well. Slowly draining soils such as silt and clay typically are more protective of ground water than coarse-grained soils such as sand and gravel. Similarly, fine-grained sediments in the subsurface and a water depth of more than 300 feet from the surface protect the ground water from contamination.

Hydrologic sensitivity was rated moderate for Well #1 and Well #2 (Table 3). This is based upon regional soil classifications as poor to moderate and moderate to well drained. Soils with poor to moderate drainage characteristics are thought to have better filtration capabilities than faster draining soils. The vadose zone composition for the wells is unknown because well log information was unavailable to assess the subsurface materials. If the vadose zone is comprised of gravel or fractured rock, it will provide less protection from contamination than finer-grained sedimentary materials. According to the sanitary survey (DEQ, 2000), the static water level is approximately 45 feet below ground surface for both wells. Based upon the static water level data, the depth to first ground water for Well #1 and Well #2 is less than 300 feet from the surface. With all factors equal, water taken from a greater ground water depth will result in contaminant reduction through absorption and/or other dispersion mechanisms (Idaho Source Water Assessment Plan, October 1999, p. E-59). Whether a 50-foot thick fine-grained zone is present in the subsurface for Well #1 and Well #2 is unknown. A 50-foot thick zone can provide additional protection by reducing the downward movement of contaminants.

## Well Construction

Well construction directly affects the ability of the well to protect the aquifer from contaminants. System construction scores are reduced when information shows that potential contaminants will have a more difficult time reaching the intake of the well. Lower scores imply a system that can better protect the water. If the casing and annular seal both extend into a low permeability unit then the possibility of cross contamination from other aquifer layers is reduced and the system construction score goes down. If the highest production interval is more than 100 feet below the water table, then the system is considered to have better buffering capabilities. When information was adequate, a determination was made as to whether the casing and annular seals extend into low permeability units and whether current public water system (PWS) construction standards are met.

Well driller's logs were not available for the Country Haven Utilities Well #1 and Well #2. If well log information is available, the susceptibility scores for the wells may change because proper well construction and well location are important when evaluating the susceptibility of drinking water sources to contamination.

The IDWR *Well Construction Standards Rules (1993)* require all public water systems (PWSs) to follow DEQ standards. IDAPA 58.01.08.550 requires that PWSs follow the *Recommended Standards for Water Works (1997)* during construction. Under current standards, all PWS wells are required to have a 50-foot buffer around the wellhead. These standards are used to rate the system construction for the well by evaluating items such as condition of wellhead and surface seal, whether the casing and annular space is within consolidated material or 18 feet below the surface, the thickness of the casing, etc. Pump tests for wells producing greater than 50 gallons per minute (gpm) require a minimum of a 6-hour test. If all criteria are not met, the public water source does not meet the IDWR Well Construction Standards. For Country Haven Utilities, both wells did not meet the well construction standards for a public water system.

The system construction scores were rated high for both wells. For Well #1, the wellhead and surface seal was considered maintained and in acceptable condition. An approved casing vent should be installed on Well #1 so that the space between the well's casing and the column is vented to the atmosphere. The well casing vents should also have 24-mesh screens to restrict animals from entering the well column (DEQ Sanitary Survey, 2000). In June 1999, the system replaced the well cap for Well #2 with one that is intended for outdoor use (Country Haven Utilities, 2002). No information was available to assess whether the wells' annular seal extended into a low permeable unit, or whether their well casings were placed into low permeable material. When the annular seal and well casing extends into a low permeable material, such as clay, it may decrease the well's susceptibility to laterally migrating contamination. DEQ was unable to assess whether the casing thickness met the recommended casing thickness guidelines for public drinking water wells. According to the sanitary survey, Well #1 has a 6-inch diameter casing. It is recommended to have a casing thickness of 0.280-inch for a 6-inch diameter casing. Well #2 has a 8-inch diameter casing and should have a 0.322-inch casing thickness. A thicker casing may prolong the life of the well. No pump test information was available to establish whether the wells met DEQ requirements. It is also unknown whether both wells highest water-producing zone were least 100 feet below the static water level. When water is drawn from deeper levels of the aquifer, it may provide a buffer from contaminants. Both wells are located outside of a 100-year floodplain. This may decrease the chance of contaminants being drawn into the drinking water source from surface water flooding. Protection from surface water flooding is highly dependent on proper well and well house construction. The wellhead for Well #1 is located within a house, whereas Well #2 is outside.

There is no indication of whether the wells have the required sanitary setback (50-foot radius) around the wellhead. A sanitary setback is important to prevent direct access to the wells and reduce the risk of contamination. A summary for the Country Haven Utilities wells has been provided with this assessment (Table 1).

**Table 1. Well Construction Summary for Country Haven Utilities**

Well	Depth (feet)	Casing Diameter (inch)	Casing Thickness (inch)	Casing Depth (feet)	Static Water Level Below land surface (feet)	Screened Interval (feet)	Surface Seal Depth (feet)	Year Drilled	IDWR Standards Met?
1	120	6	NA	NA	45	NA	NA	NA	No
2	140	8	NA	NA	45	NA	NA	1972	No

NA = Not Available

### Potential Contaminant Source and Land Use

The potential contaminant sources and land use within the delineated zones of water contribution are assessed to determine each well's susceptibility. When agriculture is the predominant land use in the area, this may increase the likelihood of agricultural wastewater infiltrating the ground water system. Agricultural land is counted as a source of leachable contaminants and points are assigned to this rating based on the percentage of agricultural land. The land use in this area is considered irrigated cropland.

In terms of potential contaminant sources and land use susceptibility, Well #1 and Well #2 rated high for IOCs (i.e., nitrates), VOCs (i.e. petroleum related products), SOCs (i.e., pesticides) and microbial contaminants (i.e., fecal coliform). Refer to Table 2 for potential contaminant inventory.

**Table 2. Country Haven Utilities Well #1 and Well #2 Potential Contaminant Inventory.**

Site Number	Source Description	TOT Zone (Years)	Source Information	Potential Contaminants
	Aberdeen-Springfield Canal	0-3	GIS Map	IOC, VOC, SOC, Microbes
	Union Pacific Railroad	0-3	GIS Map	IOC, VOC, SOC, Microbes
	State Route 39	0-3	GIS Map	IOC, VOC, SOC, Microbes
	Highway 26	0-3	GIS Map	IOC, VOC, SOC, Microbes
1	Dairy	0-3	Database Inventory	IOC, Microbes
2	Dairy	0-3	Database Inventory	IOC, Microbes
3	BML Site <sup>3</sup> - General Contractors	0-3	Database Inventory	IOC, VOC, SOC
4	BML Site - Cemeteries	0-3	Database Inventory	IOC, VOC
5	SARA <sup>4</sup> Site	0-3	Database Inventory	SOC
6	Wastewater Land Application Site	0-3	Database Inventory	IOC, Microbes
7	Mine	3-6	Database Inventory	IOC, VOC, SOC
8	Deep Injection Well	6-10	Database Inventory	IOC, VOC, SOC
9	Deep Injection Well	6-10	Database Inventory	IOC, VOC, SOC
10	Deep Injection Well-Active	6-10	Database Inventory	IOC, VOC, SOC
11	Deep Injection Well-Active	6-10	Database Inventory	IOC, VOC, SOC
12	Deep Injection Well-Active	6-10	Database Inventory	IOC, VOC, SOC
13	Deep Injection Well-Active	6-10	Database Inventory	IOC, VOC, SOC
14	Deep Injection Well-Active	6-10	Database Inventory	IOC, VOC, SOC
15	Recharge Point-Unused	6-10	Database Inventory	IOC, VOC, SOC
16	Recharge Point-Unused	6-10	Database Inventory	IOC, VOC, SOC
17	Recharge Point-Unused	6-10	Database Inventory	IOC, VOC, SOC

<sup>1</sup> TOT = time-of-travel (in years) for a potential contaminant to reach the wellhead

<sup>2</sup> IOC = inorganic chemical, VOC = volatile organic chemical, SOC = synthetic organic chemical

<sup>3</sup> BML Site = Business Mailing List Site

<sup>4</sup> SARA = Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act)

## Final Susceptibility Rating

A detection above a drinking water standard (MCL), any detection of a VOC or SOC, or having potential contaminant sources within 50 feet of the wellhead will automatically give a high susceptibility rating to the final well ranking despite the land use of the area because a pathway for contamination already exists. If potential contaminant sources are within 50 feet of a wellhead, this will automatically lead to a high susceptibility rating. Hydrologic sensitivity and system construction scores are heavily weighted in the final scores. Having multiple potential contaminant sources in the 0 to 3-year time of travel zone (Zone 1B) and a large percentage of agricultural land contribute greatly to the overall ranking. The final susceptibility rankings are: Well #1 and Well #2 are high for IOC, VOC, SOC, and microbial contaminants. These ratings reflect the hydrologic sensitivity, system construction, and potential contaminants inventory and land use within the delineated source water assessment areas for the Country Haven Utilities wells. Refer to Table 3 for the Susceptibility Analysis Summary.



**Table 3. Summary of Country Haven Utilities Susceptibility Analysis**

Drinking Water Source	Susceptibility Scores									
	Hydrologic Sensitivity	Potential Contaminant <sup>1</sup> Inventory and Land Use				System Construction	Final Susceptibility Ranking			
		IOC	VOC	SOC	Microbials		IOC	VOC	SOC	Microbials
Well #1	M	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H
Well #2	M	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H

**H = High Susceptibility, M = Moderate Susceptibility, L = Low Susceptibility; <sup>1</sup>IOC = inorganic chemical, VOC = volatile organic chemical, SOC = synthetic organic chemical**

### Susceptibility Summary

The IOCs (arsenic, calcium, fluoride, iron, nitrate, sodium) and RADs (gross alpha, gross Beta, combined radium, radium-226) represent the main water chemistry recorded for the Country Haven Utilities public water system. The reported concentrations of these chemicals were below the MCL for each chemical. All water chemistry tests for the Country Haven Utilities wells have not detected VOCs and SOC. Although there were detects of arsenic in December 1996, they were below the MCL of 50 µg/L. In February 2002, the EPA lowered the arsenic MCL to 10 µg/L, giving systems until 2006 to comply with the new standard. The nitrate levels in the Country Haven Utilities wells were well below the action level (meet or exceed half the MCL). If nitrate levels increase the system will need to look into remediation to reduce nitrate concentrations.

Total coliform bacteria were detected at various locations within the distribution system. When bacteria was identified in September 1999, a boil advisory was required until bacteria was no longer present in the distribution system. Since January 2002, there have been no detects of total coliform in the system.

In this area, the county level nitrogen fertilizer use is considered high, and the herbicide use and overall agriculture-chemical use is high due to the amount of agricultural land in this area. Although there may only be a small portion of agriculture land in the direct vicinity of the wellheads, it is useful as a tool in determining the overall chemical usage such as pesticides and how it may impact ground water through infiltration and surface water runoff. Potential contaminant sources were identified within the wells 3-, 6-, and 10-year TOT delineated capture zones and were documented (Figure 2 and Table 2).

## Section 4. Options for Drinking Water Protection

This assessment should be used as a basis for determining appropriate new protection measures or re-evaluating existing protection efforts. No matter what ranking a source receives, protection is always important. Whether the source is currently located in a “pristine” area or an area with numerous industrial and/or agricultural land uses that require surveillance, the way to ensure good water quality in the future is to act now to protect valuable water supply resources. If the system should need to expand in the future, new well sites should be located in areas with as few potential sources of contamination as possible, and the site should be reserved and protected for this specific use.

An effective drinking water protection program is tailored to the particular local drinking water protection area. A community with a fully developed drinking water protection program will incorporate many strategies. For drinking water protection, Country Haven Utilities should focus on correcting any deficiencies that were outlined in the sanitary survey. The wellheads need to be properly maintained and protected. Protection includes no application or storage of herbicides, pesticides or other chemicals within 50 feet from the wellhead. Limiting road access near wellheads can reduce the potential for contamination from spills or releases. If microbial contamination becomes a concern, the system should take appropriate measures to disinfect the system. If IOC levels continue to increase, the system should investigate remediation options such as reverse osmosis. Once drinking water wells are protected, the system can focus on documenting types and locations of potential contaminant sources. These potential contaminant sources can be point sources, such as a new gas station, or non-point sources, such as storm water runoff. Any new sources that may be considered potential contaminants should be investigated and if need be monitored to prevent future contamination. Land uses within the area should also be evaluated. Areas with higher than normal agricultural land use may have increases in agricultural wastewater runoff that could infiltrate the ground water. Land uses within most of the source water assessment area are well beyond Country Haven Utilities. Therefore partnerships with state and local agencies, industrial and commercial groups should be established to ensure future land uses are protective of ground water quality. Educating employees and the public about source water will further assist the system in its monitoring and protection efforts.

Due to the time involved with the movement of ground water, drinking water protection activities should be aimed at long-term management strategies even though these strategies may not yield results in the near term. A strong public education program should be a primary focus of any drinking water protection plan. Public education topics could include proper lawn and garden care practices, household hazardous waste disposal methods, proper care and maintenance of septic systems, and the importance of water conservation to name but a few. There are multiple resources available to help communities implement protection programs, including the Drinking Water Academy of the EPA. Drinking water protection activities for agriculture should be coordinated with the Idaho State Department of Agriculture and the Bingham County Soil and Water Conservation District. As major transportation corridors intersect the delineation (such as State Route 39 and Highway 26), the Idaho Department of Transportation should be involved in protection efforts. If the system should need to expand in the future, new well sites should be located in areas with as few potential sources of contamination as possible, and the site should be reserved and protected for this specific use.

A system must incorporate a variety of strategies in order to develop a comprehensive drinking water protection plan, be they regulatory in nature (i.e. zoning ordinances) or non-regulatory (i.e. public education, specific best management practices). For assistance in developing protection strategies please contact the Pocatello Regional Office of the DEQ or the Idaho Rural Water Association.

**Assistance**

Public water supplies and others may call the following DEQ offices with questions about this assessment and to request assistance with developing and implementing a local protection plan. In addition, draft protection plans may be submitted to the DEQ office for preliminary review and comments.

DEQ Pocatello Regional Office           (208) 236-6160

DEQ State Office                           (208) 373-0502

Website: <http://www.deq.state.id.us>

Water suppliers serving fewer than 10,000 persons may contact Ms. Melinda Harper at (208) 343-7001 or email her at [mlharper@idahoruralwater.com](mailto:mlharper@idahoruralwater.com) for assistance with drinking water protection (formerly wellhead protection) strategies.

## References

- Ackerman, D.J., 1995, Analysis of Steady-State Flow and Advective Transport in the Eastern Snake River Plain Aquifer System, Idaho, U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 94-4257, 25 p. I-FY95
- Bechtel Environmental, Inc., 1994, Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study, Groundwater Flow Monitoring Report, 95 p.
- Corbett, M.K., J.E. Anderson, and J.C. Mitchell, 1980, An Evaluation of Thermal Water Occurrences in the Tyhee Area, Bannock County, Idaho, Idaho Department of Water Resources, Water Information Bulletin, No. 30, 67 p.
- Cosgrove, D.M., G.S. Johnson, S. Laney, and J. Lindgren, 1999, Description of the IDWR/UI Snake River Plain Aquifer Model (SRPAM), Idaho Water Resources Research Institute, University of Idaho, 95 p.
- Country Haven Utilities, June 2002, Facsimile from Sheila Babneau with system modifications.
- deSonneville, J.L.J, 1972, Development of a Mathematical Groundwater Model: Water Resources Research Institute, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho, 227 p.
- Garabedian, S.P., 1992, Hydrology and Digital Simulation of the Regional Aquifer System, Eastern Snake River Plain, Idaho, U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1408-F, 102 p., 10 pl. I-FY92.
- Great Lakes-Upper Mississippi River Board of State and Provincial Public Health and Environment Managers, 1997. "Recommended Standards for Water Works."
- Idaho Division of Environmental Quality Ground Water Program, October 1999. Idaho Source Water Assessment Plan.
- Idaho Department of Environmental Quality. 2000. Design Standards for Public Drinking Water Systems. IDAPA 58.01.08.550.01.
- Idaho Department of Environmental Quality. 2000. Country Haven Utilities Water system Sanitary Survey: PWS #6060013
- Idaho Department of Water Resources, 1993. Administrative Rules of the Idaho Water Resource Board: Well Construction Standards Rules. IDAPA 37.03.09.
- Idaho Department of Water Resources, 1997, Upper Snake River Basin Study, 85 p.
- Jacobson, N.D., 1982, Ground-Water Conditions in the Eastern Part of Michaud Flats, Fort Hall Indian Reservation, Idaho, U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 82-570, 35 p.

- Jacobson, N.D., 1984, Hydrogeology of Eastern Michaud Flats, Fort Hall Indian Reservation, Idaho,
- Kjelstrom, L.C., 1995, Streamflow Gains and Losses in the Snake River and Ground-Water Budgets for the Snake River Plain, Idaho and Eastern Oregon, U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1408-C, 47 p. I-FY95.
- Lindholm, G.F., 1996, Summary of the Snake River Plain Regional Aquifer-System analysis in Idaho and Eastern Oregon, U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1408-A, 59 p.
- State Drinking Water Information System (SDWIS). Idaho Department of Environmental Quality.
- United States Geological Survey, 2001, Current Streamflow Conditions, [http://idaho.usgs.gov/rt-cgi/gen\\_tbl\\_pg](http://idaho.usgs.gov/rt-cgi/gen_tbl_pg).
- Washington Group International, Inc, October 2001. Source Area Delineation Report for the East Margin Area of the Eastern Snake River Plain Hydrologic Province.
- Whitehead, R.L., 1992, Geohydrologic Framework of the Snake River Plain Regional Aquifer System, Idaho and Eastern Oregon, U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1408-B, 32p. I-FY92

## POTENTIAL CONTAMINANT INVENTORY LIST OF ACRONYMS AND DEFINITIONS

**AST (Aboveground Storage Tanks)** – Sites with aboveground storage tanks.

**Business Mailing List** – This list contains potential contaminant sites identified through a yellow pages database search of standard industry codes (SIC).

**CERCLIS** – This includes sites considered for listing under the **Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA)**. CERCLA, more commonly known as A Superfund is designed to clean up hazardous waste sites that are on the national priority list (NPL).

**Cyanide Site** – DEQ permitted and known historical sites/facilities using cyanide.

**Dairy** – Sites included in the primary contaminant source inventory represent those facilities regulated by Idaho State Department of Agriculture (ISDA) and may range from a few head to several thousand head of milking cows.

**Deep Injection Well** – Injection wells regulated under the Idaho Department of Water Resources generally for the disposal of stormwater runoff or agricultural field drainage.

**Enhanced Inventory** – Enhanced inventory locations are potential contaminant source sites added by the water system. These can include new sites not captured during the primary contaminant inventory, or corrected locations for sites not properly located during the primary contaminant inventory. Enhanced inventory sites can also include miscellaneous sites added by the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) during the primary contaminant inventory.

**Floodplain** – This is a coverage of the 100-year floodplains.

**Group 1 Sites** – These are sites that show elevated levels of contaminants and are not within the priority one areas.

**Inorganic Priority Area** – Priority one areas where greater than 25% of the wells/springs show constituents higher than primary standards or other health standards.

**Landfill** – Areas of open and closed municipal and non-municipal landfills.

**LUST (Leaking Underground Storage Tank)** – Potential contaminant source sites associated with leaking underground storage tanks as regulated under RCRA.

**Mines and Quarries** – Mines and quarries permitted through the Idaho Department of Lands.)

**Nitrate Priority Area** – Area where greater than 25% of wells/springs show nitrate values above 5 mg/L.

**NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System)**

– Sites with NPDES permits. The Clean Water Act requires that any discharge of a pollutant to waters of the United States from a point source must be authorized by an NPDES permit.

**Organic Priority Areas** – These are any areas where greater than 25 % of wells/springs show levels greater than 1% of the primary standard or other health standards.

**Recharge Point** – This includes active, proposed, and possible recharge sites on the Snake River Plain.

**RCRIS** – Site regulated under **Resource Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA)**. RCRA is commonly associated with the cradle to grave management approach for generation, storage, and disposal of hazardous wastes.

**SARA Tier II (Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act Tier II Facilities)** – These sites store certain types and amounts of hazardous materials and must be identified under the Community Right to Know Act.

**Toxic Release Inventory (TRI)** – The toxic release inventory list was developed as part of the Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know (Community Right to Know) Act passed in 1986. The Community Right to Know Act requires the reporting of any release of a chemical found on the TRI list.

**UST (Underground Storage Tank)** – Potential contaminant source sites associated with underground storage tanks regulated as regulated under RCRA.

**Wastewater Land Applications Sites** – These are areas where the land application of municipal or industrial wastewater is permitted by DEQ.

**Wellheads** – These are drinking water well locations regulated under the Safe Drinking Water Act. They are not treated as potential contaminant sources.

**NOTE:** Many of the potential contaminant sources were located using a geocoding program where mailing addresses are used to locate a facility. Field verification of potential contaminant sources is an important element of an enhanced inventory.

# Appendix A

## Country Haven Utilities Susceptibility Analysis Worksheets

The final scores for the susceptibility analysis were determined using the following formulas:

- 1) VOC/SOC/IOC Final Score = Hydrologic Sensitivity + System Construction + (Potential Contaminant/Land Use x 0.2)
- 2) Microbial Final Score = Hydrologic Sensitivity + System Construction + (Potential Contaminant/Land Use x 0.35)

Final Susceptibility Scoring:

0 - 5    Low Susceptibility

6 - 12   Moderate Susceptibility

≥ 13    High Susceptibility



## 1. System Construction

SCORE

Drill Date	Unknown	
Driller Log Available	NO	
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	YES	2000
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO	1
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO	1
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO	2
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO	1
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain	YES	0

Total System Construction Score 5

## 2. Hydrologic Sensitivity

Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES	0
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES	1
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO	1
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	NO	2

Total Hydrologic Score 4

## 3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A

IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------------

Land Use Zone 1A	IRRIGATED CROPLAND	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	YES	2	0	2	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		4	2	4	2

## Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B

Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	9	6	6	7
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	8
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	12	6	6	
4 Points Maximum		4	4	4	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	0	0	2	0
Land use Zone 1B Greater Than 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land		4	4	4	4
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		16	16	18	12

## Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II

Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II 25 to 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land		1	1	1	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		4	4	4	0

## Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III

Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0

Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score 26 24 28 14

## 4. Final Susceptibility Source Score

15 15 16 15

## 5. Final Well Ranking

High High High High

## 1. System Construction

SCORE

Drill Date	1/1/72	
Driller Log Available	NO	
Sanitary Survey (if yes, indicate date of last survey)	YES	2000
Well meets IDWR construction standards	NO	1
Wellhead and surface seal maintained	NO	1
Casing and annular seal extend to low permeability unit	NO	2
Highest production 100 feet below static water level	NO	1
Well located outside the 100 year flood plain and protected from surface water runoff	NO (No approved casing vent)	1
Total System Construction Score		6

## 2. Hydrologic Sensitivity

Soils are poorly to moderately drained	YES	0
Vadose zone composed of gravel, fractured rock or unknown	YES	1
Depth to first water > 300 feet	NO	1
Aquitard present with > 50 feet cumulative thickness	NO	2
Total Hydrologic Score		4

## 3. Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1A

IOC Score	VOC Score	SOC Score	Microbial Score
-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------------

Land Use Zone 1A	IRRIGATED CROPLAND	2	2	2	2
Farm chemical use high	YES	2	0	2	
IOC, VOC, SOC, or Microbial sources in Zone 1A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Total Potential Contaminant Source/Land Use Score - Zone 1A		4	2	4	2

## Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE 1B

Contaminant sources present (Number of Sources)	YES	9	6	6	7
(Score = # Sources X 2 ) 8 Points Maximum		8	8	8	8
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or 4 Points Maximum	YES	12	6	6	
Zone 1B contains or intercepts a Group 1 Area	YES	4	4	4	
Land use Zone 1B	Greater Than 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land	0	0	2	0
		4	4	4	4
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone 1B		16	16	18	12

## Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE II

Contaminant Sources Present	YES	2	2	2	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Land Use Zone II	25 to 50% Irrigated Agricultural Land	1	1	1	
Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone II		4	4	4	0

## Potential Contaminant / Land Use - ZONE III

Contaminant Source Present	YES	1	1	1	
Sources of Class II or III leacheable contaminants or	YES	1	1	1	
Is there irrigated agricultural lands that occupy > 50% of	NO	0	0	0	
Total Potential Contaminant Source / Land Use Score - Zone III		2	2	2	0
Cumulative Potential Contaminant / Land Use Score		26	24	28	14

## 4. Final Susceptibility Source Score

14	14	15	14
----	----	----	----

## 5. Final Well Ranking

High	High	High	High
------	------	------	------